

REMARKS

1. *Claims 31-40: The “previously stored values” are described in the specification.*

The action rejected claims 31-40 as reciting “previously stored values” that are not disclosed, and also that there is no disclosure regarding how the values are “loaded.”

Disclosure for the “previously stored values” and the “loading” can be found in application paragraphs [0069]-[0070], reproduced below with emphasis added.

[0069] In the affirmative, the control passes to a block, designated by 414, in which the values corresponding to the last parameter values already stored are re-loaded, said values being regarded in any case as reliable as compared to the uncertain state of the values that would appear upon removal of the display unit 21 during a procedure of choice of parameters.

[0070] Therefore, in a block 415, there is performed the operation of resetting the operating mode, which stops the procedure (in particular the zero-setting or compensation step) that was running. Once the system recognizes that the display unit is missing, it first reloads the last reliable values it has (block 414), it then stops the procedure that was running (block 415) and finally puts itself in the “basic” or normal way of working in block 416.

2. *Claims 1-30: Campagnolo fails to teach or suggest that removal of block 10 results in inhibiting the functionality of system 1.*

The action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 18, 19, 21-23, 25-27, and 30 as anticipated by US Publication 2001/0027495 to Campagnolo or obvious over Campagnolo in view of US Publication 2003/0160686 to Uno and US Publication

2003/0078716 to Takeda. The contents of the earlier replies remains equally relevant to the patentability of the claims but for simplicity's sake, this reply focuses on the enclosed declaration and further distinctions not previously discussed in greater detail.

US Publication 2001/0027495 to Campagnolo is clear:

[0052] The block 20, which basically has the function of a communication unit, is mainly entrusted with the task of:
[0053] verifying that the system 1 is utilizable, in the sense that all the functional blocks 10, 20 and 30 are present and connected together; for example, removal of the block 10, which has the function of a display unit, is detected in the way just described, i.e., as a result of the removal of the resistor 10R, whereby the block 20 intervenes on the system 1 inhibiting complete functionality of the latter....

Thus, Campagnolo states that when the block 10 is removed, the block 20 intervenes to inhibit complete functionality of the system 1. Declaration of Valentino Campagnolo, paragraph G.

Campagnolo paragraph [0053] further states:

[0053] the block 20 intervenes on the system 1 inhibiting complete functionality of the latter, or, at least, as regards the functions linked to the presence of the block 10.

Thus, Campagnolo will at least inhibit all functions related to the presence of block 10. According to Campagnolo paragraph [0055], these functions include locomotive functions. This can be seen because the gear shifting push-buttons 28, 29 requests are transferred to "the block 10." Thus, removal of block 10 results in block 20

inhibiting the “complete functionality” of the locomotive functions related to push-buttons 28,29. Declaration of Valentino Campagnolo, paragraph H.

Because removal of block 10 inhibits locomotive functions, Campagnolo fails to teach or suggest what is claimed, namely:

wherein the second unit performs the set of basic locomotion functions when said first unit is removed from the cycle (Claim 1);

wherein said processing unit is configured for implementing a set of basic locomotion functions when said further unit is removed from the cycle (Claim 10);

wherein removal of the control unit from the cycle enables said complementary unit to implement a set of basic locomotion functions (Claim 11);

wherein the control/power unit is operable by the person through the display unit or in the absence or lack of functionality of the display unit, through the control/power unit (Claim 18);

wherein the second unit performs the set of basic locomotion functions when said first unit is removed from the cycle (Claim 27); and

at least one control unit, which is functionally connected with and exchanges operational information with the at least one display unit regarding the cycle's locomotion functions and is capable of continuing to perform a set of basic locomotion functions if the connection with and exchange of operational information with the at least one display unit is interrupted (Claim 30).

Thus, claims 1, 10, 11, 18, 27, and 30, including claims depending therefrom,

should be allowable.

3. *Claims 31-40: Campagnolo fails to teach or suggest that “the second unit implements the basic locomotion functions using previously stored values” and that “the previously stored values are loaded into the second unit in the absence or lack of functionality of the first unit” and similar wordings.*

Claims 31, 33, 35, 37, and 39 recite that the second (or corresponding) unit implements certain functions based on stored values, when the first (or corresponding) unit is not present. There is no teaching in Campagnolo that its unit 20 implements locomotion functions based on “previously stored” values.

Further, as specifically recited in claims 32, 34, 36, 38, and 40, Campagnolo does not teach or suggest that “the previously stored values are loaded into the second unit in the absence or lack of functionality of the first unit.” Thus, as claimed, when the first unit¹ is removed or not functional, the second unit has certain previously stored values that allow it to perform the basic set of locomotive functions. Nothing of this sort is taught in Campagnolo.

For these reasons, claims 31-40 are also believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a

¹ The other claims use terms different than “first unit” and “second unit” to the same purpose for the sake of this

Applicant: Gianfranco Guderzo
Application No.: 10/806,569

telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including the withdrawn claims, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Gianfranco Guderzo

By /Stephen B. Schott/
Stephen B. Schott
Registration No. 51,294

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

SBS/jal